arXiv:1409.7347v1 [astro-ph.GA] 25 Sep 2014

Wave Dark Matter and the Tully-Fisher Relation

Hubert Bray, Andrew Goetz

September 26, 2014

Abstract

We investigate a theory of dark matter called wave dark matter, also known as scalar field dark matter (SFDM) and boson star dark matter or Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) dark matter, in spherical symmetry and its relation to the Tully-Fisher relation. We show that fixing the oscillation frequency of wave dark matter near the edge of dark galactic halos implies a Tully-Fisher-like relation for those halos. We then describe how this boundary condition, which is roughly equivalent to fixing the half-length of the exponentially decaying tail of each galactic halo mass profile, may yield testable predictions for this theory of dark matter.

1 Introduction

Beginning in the 1970s, astronomers were surprised to discover that the stars in a typical spiral galaxy of baryonic mass M_b are all orbiting the galactic center at roughly the same characteristic velocity V [17, 1], and furthermore that the quantity

$$k_{\text{TF}} = \frac{M_b}{V^4} \approx 45 \frac{M_\odot}{(\text{km/s})^4} \tag{1}$$

is a constant across galaxies [22, 12]. The latter relation is known as the (baryonic) Tully-Fisher relation. Since the rotational velocity of a galaxy depends on its mass, which is comprised mostly of dark matter, it is possible, if not probable, that the Tully-Fisher relation is intimately linked with the nature of dark matter.

Theories of dark matter abound. The most popular theory today is that dark matter is a Weakly Interacting Massive Particle, or WIMP, but if there is any connection between WIMPs and the Tully-Fisher relation, it has eluded discovery thus far. In this paper we investigate a theory we have termed *wave dark matter* [2, 3, 4, 15, 16]. It has been investigated before under other names such as scalar field dark matter (SFDM) [8, 10, 21] and boson star dark matter or Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) dark matter [20, 9, 19]. The difference in names comes from a difference in motivations, but the underlying equation is the Klein Gordon wave equation (4b) for a scalar field.

Our main result is that fixing the oscillation frequency of wave dark matter near the edge of dark galactic halos implies a Tully-Fisher-like relation for those halos. Specifically, we require that

$$\omega_{\text{true}}(R_{\text{DM}} + r_0) = \omega_0 \tag{2}$$

for some fixed r_0, ω_0. Here $\omega_{\text{true}}(r)$ is the frequency of the dark matter at radius r and R_{DM} is the radius of the dark matter halo, precisely defined later. We comment that $r_0 \ll R_{\text{DM}}$. In an upcoming paper [7] we show that this condition is one of a general class of "Tully-Fisher boundary conditions" that one can impose at the outer edge of dark halos, all of which produce Tully-Fisher-like relations. For example, another Tully-Fisher boundary condition, roughly equivalent to equation (2), is to require that each wave dark matter halo mass profile has the same half-length for its exponentially decaying tail.

These results lead, given some assumptions, to testable predictions of the theory of wave dark matter. Specifically, if the conjectures in section 6 are correct, then we should be able to predict the total mass profile of a galaxy if we are given its baryonic mass profile.

2 Modified Newtonian Dynamics

We comment that there is another theory of dark matter, known as Modified Newtonian Dynamics or MOND [13, 5], which, while it has other issues, can claim to explain the flat rotation curves of spiral galaxies and the Tully-Fisher relation. Indeed, it was designed for this purpose. It is a bit of a misnomer to call it a theory of dark matter because, as its name suggests, instead of postulating the existence of extra matter which obeys the usual law of gravity, it modifies the law itself. In essence, whereas the combination of Newton's second law and law of gravity gives an acceleration due to gravity

$$a = \frac{GM}{r^2},$$

MOND postulates

$$a = \frac{\sqrt{GMa_0}}{r},$$

for an acceleration a much less than a threshold acceleration a_0. The inclusion of the threshold acceleration is to leave solar system dynamics virtually unchanged. One immediately sees that for circular motion where $a = v^2/r$, we get $v = (GMa_0)^{1/4}$ (velocity independent of radius) and $M/v^4 = (Ga_0)^{-1}$ (a Tully-Fisher relation), which seems promising. However, the theory has its own conflicts with data. One of the most problematic is that although MOND was created to get rid of the missing mass problem in galaxies, it has a missing mass problem at the level of clusters [6, 18]. Even more problematic is the "bullet cluster", whose existence seems to demonstrate that dark matter exists in large quantities and can be separated from baryonic matter [11]. Hence, MOND remains a minority viewpoint among astrophysicists. Even so, there is still the important question of why it works so well for spiral galaxies.

3 Wave Dark Matter

We now introduce the basics of wave dark matter so that we can describe our main result. Our main reference for the summary given here is [2]. Recall that in general relativity the fundamental object is a spacetime N with a Lorentzian metric g and stress-energy tensor T satisfying the Einstein equation

$$G = 8\pi T. \tag{3}$$

(We use geometrized units throughout, with the gravitational constant and the speed of light set equal to 1.) Here $G = \mathrm{Ric} - \frac{1}{2}Rg$ is the Einstein curvature tensor for N. It is well-known that the vacuum Einstein equation ($G = 0$) can be obtained from a variational principle by requiring that the metric g is a critical point of the Hilbert functional $\int_N R$ where R is the scalar curvature. The connection ∇ used to compute curvature is usually assumed to be the Levi-Civita connection. In [2] the author removed the assumption that the connection is the Levi-Civita one and investigated a general class of functionals which depend on the connection as well as the metric. The Hilbert functional is included in this class. It was found that deviation of the connection from the standard Levi-Civita connection could be described by a scalar function f on the spacetime. Furthermore, requiring the metric g and connection ∇ to be critical points of the functionals led to the Einstein-Klein-Gordon (EKG) equations below.

$$G = 8\pi \left(\frac{df \otimes d\bar{f} + d\bar{f} \otimes df}{\Upsilon^2} - \left(\frac{|df|^2}{\Upsilon^2} + |f|^2 \right) g + T_b \right) \tag{4a}$$

$$\Box_g f = \Upsilon^2 f \tag{4b}$$

The scalar function f represents the dark matter, and we take it to be complex. We have added in a stress-energy tensor T_b to allow for baryonic matter. It turns out that we may set $T_b = 0$ for the purposes of this paper, except for the stability conjectures stated in section 6. The constant Υ is a fundamental constant of nature yet to be precisely determined, though working values are given in [10, 4]. For those who approach wave dark matter from a particle physics viewpoint instead of the geometric viewpoint described here, the fundamental constant is the mass m of the dark matter particle. The relationship between Υ and m is

$$m = \frac{\hbar \Upsilon}{c} = 1.31 \times 10^{-22}\,\mathrm{eV} \left(\frac{\Upsilon}{1\,\mathrm{ly}^{-1}} \right). \tag{5}$$

4 Spherically Symmetric Static States

We wish to investigate wave dark matter in the context of galaxies. The dark matter in galaxies is distributed in an approximately spherical halo, so we will take our spacetime

metric to be spherically symmetric and write it in polar-areal form [14]:

$$g = -e^{2V(t,r)}\,dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M(t,r)}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\phi\,d\phi^2). \tag{6}$$

The functions M and V have natural Newtonian interpretations in the low-field limit as the total mass enclosed inside a ball of radius r at time t and the potential at radius r and time t. We remind the reader that we are using geometrized units so that the units for time, distance, and mass are all the same. In this paper we adopt the practice of measuring all quantities in years (which are the same as light-years). In tables 1 to 3 at the end of this paper we give the values of some common astronomical units in geometrized units.

To make some formulas below more compact, we make the definition

$$\Phi(t,r) = 1 - \frac{2M(t,r)}{r}. \tag{7}$$

This term is approximately equal to 1 in the low-field limit ($M \ll r$). Thus our spacetime metric is

$$g = -e^{2V}\,dt^2 + \Phi^{-1}\,dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\phi\,d\phi^2). \tag{8}$$

We wish to solve the Einstein-Klein-Gordon (EKG) equations equations (4a) and (4b). A solution consists of a triple of functions (M, V, f). The simplest solutions are the *static states*, when f is of the form

$$f(t,r) = F(r)e^{i\omega t}, \tag{9}$$

with F real and M and V functions of r only. In this case the EKG equations simplify—see [15]—to the system of ODEs

$$M_r = 4\pi r^2 \cdot \frac{1}{\Upsilon^2}\left[\left(\Upsilon^2 + \omega^2 e^{-2V}\right)F^2 + \Phi F_r^2\right] \tag{10a}$$

$$\Phi V_r = \frac{M}{r^2} - 4\pi r \cdot \frac{1}{\Upsilon^2}\left[\left(\Upsilon^2 - \omega^2 e^{-2V}\right)F^2 - \Phi F_r^2\right] \tag{10b}$$

$$F_{rr} + \frac{2}{r}F_r + V_r F_r + \frac{\Phi_r}{\Phi}F_r = \Phi^{-1}\left(\Upsilon^2 - \omega^2 e^{-2V}\right)F. \tag{10c}$$

Note that the dependence on t has disappeared, which is why solutions to these ODEs are called static states. Our notation for a solution will be

$$(\omega; M, V, F). \tag{11}$$

Solutions can be found by numerical integration using a computer.

For initial conditions we take

$$M(0) = 0 \tag{12}$$

$$V(0) = V_0 < 0 \tag{13}$$

$$F(0) = F_0 > 0 \tag{14}$$

$$F_r(0) = 0. \tag{15}$$

(These will be explained in a moment.) We define

Definition 1

$$M_\infty = \lim_{r\to\infty} M(r) \tag{16}$$

$$V_\infty = \lim_{r\to\infty} V(r). \tag{17}$$

It is important to note that we have the freedom to add an arbitrary constant $\tilde{V}$ to the potential function $V(r)$. Looking at the form of the ODEs (10), we see that if $(\omega; M, V, F)$ is a solution, then so is $(\omega e^{\tilde{V}}; M, V + \tilde{V}, F)$. This corresponds to just a rescaling of the t coordinate by a factor of $e^{\tilde{V}}$ in the spacetime metric (8). Thus, adding a constant to $V(r)$ amounts to a change of coordinates which does not affect the solution. In this paper, we use

Convention

$$V_\infty = 0 \tag{18}$$

for our solutions so that the metric (8) is asymptotic to Minkowski spacetime at infinity.

Now we can explain our initial conditions: equation (12) comes from the physical interpretation of $M(r)$ as the total mass inside the coordinate sphere of radius r. Equation (13) is because of the convention (18). Equation (14) is another convention: if (M, V, F) is a solution, so is $(M, V, -F)$, and thus we might as well take $F(0) \geqslant 0$. We exclude $F(0) = 0$ because this leads to the trivial solution. Finally, for regularity in spherical symmetry we must have $F_r(0) = 0$; hence equation (15).

Because we are describing finite mass systems, we require

$$M_\infty < \infty. \tag{19}$$

Numerical experimentation shows that solutions having all the properties listed above come in the form of *ground states* and *excited states*. So that the reader can get a sense of the character of these solutions, in figure 1 we have graphed the ground state and first three excited states with $\Upsilon = 100$ and $\omega = 99.9$. We see that for fixed Υ and ω, there are countably many solutions corresponding to $n = 0, 1, 2\ldots$ where n is the number of zeros of F. To gain some insight into why this is the case, we consider the system (10) and make the following approximations:

$$e^{2V} \approx 1, \qquad \Phi \approx 1, \qquad \frac{V_r}{\Upsilon\|V\|_\infty} \approx 0, \qquad \frac{\Phi_r}{\Upsilon\|V\|_\infty} \approx 0 \tag{20}$$

$$\frac{\omega}{\Upsilon} \approx 1, \qquad \frac{F_r}{\Upsilon\|F\|_\infty} \approx 0. \tag{21}$$

The approximations in (20) may be interpreted as saying that the metric (8) is close to the Minkowski metric (the low-field limit), and the approximations in (21) may be interpreted as saying that the group velocities of wave dark matter are much less than



Figure 1: The ground state (top row) and first three excited states (second, third, and fourth rows) with $\Upsilon = 100$ and $\omega = 99.99$. The vertical black line in each plot marks the location of $R_{\rm DM}$.

the speed of light (the nonrelativistic limit). Applying all these approximations to the system (10) leads to the system

$$M_r = 4\pi r^2 \cdot 2F^2 \tag{22a}$$

$$V_r = \frac{M}{r^2} \tag{22b}$$

$$F_{rr} + \frac{2}{r}F_r = 2\Upsilon^2(1 - \omega/\Upsilon + V)F. \tag{22c}$$

As long as we are in the low-field, nonrelativistic limit, these systems are practically equivalent. See figure 3. Thus, to understand the system (10) in the low-field, nonrelativistic limit it suffices to understand the system (22).

From equation (22a) we see that the quantity $2F^2$ is the mass-energy density at radius r. The second equation (22b) is familiar from Newtonian gravity. The third equation (22c) is the most interesting. The reader might recognize the left side as the expression for the Laplacian of a spherically symmetric function on $\mathbb{R}^3$. Let us consider for a moment the differential equation

$$F_{rr} + \frac{2}{r}F_r = kF. \tag{23}$$

If we let $h(r) = rF(r)$, then the corresponding differential equation for h is $h_{rr} = kh$. Thus the general solution to equation (23) is

$$F(r) = \begin{cases} A\frac{e^{\sqrt{k}r}}{r} + B\frac{e^{-\sqrt{k}r}}{r} & k > 0 \\ A + \frac{B}{r} & k = 0 \\ A\frac{\sin(\sqrt{-k}r)}{r} + B\frac{\cos(\sqrt{-k}r)}{r} & k < 0 \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

Thus, on any interval where the expression $k(r) = 2\Upsilon^2(1 - \omega/\Upsilon + V(r))$ is roughly constant, the solution to equation (22c) will look like one of the three solutions in equation (24). More explicitly, when $k(r)$ is negative, F will exhibit oscillatory behavior, and when $k(r)$ is positive, F will exhibit exponential behavior. Since V is an increasing function, $k(r)$ increases with r. Remembering that one of our requirements on a solution (M, V, F) is that $M_\infty < \infty$, looking at equation (22a) we see that F must exponentially decay after a certain point. Since we are also requiring $V_\infty = 0$, we must take $\omega < \Upsilon$ so that $\lim_{r\to\infty} k(r) = 2\Upsilon^2(1 - \omega/\Upsilon) > 0$. On the other hand, $k(r)$ cannot be positive (i.e., F cannot have exponential behavior) for all r; looking at equation (24), we see that this would be in contradiction with the requirements from spherical symmetry that $M_r(0) = F_r(0) = 0$. Thus, the only situation consistent with our requirements is when $0 < \omega < \Upsilon$, such that $k(r)$ begins negative and limits to $2\Upsilon^2(1 - \omega/\Upsilon)$. The corresponding behavior of F is to start out oscillating and then to switch over to exponential behavior. The switch occurs at the point where $k(r) = 0$; we label this point R_{DM} (see figure 1) and view it physically as approximately the point where the dark matter halo ends, since F decays exponentially thereafter.



Figure 2: A typical fifth excited state ($n = 5$) demonstrating the location of R_{DM} (see definition 2). We have omitted the plot of the potential $V(r)$. To the left of R_{DM}, $F(r)$ exhibits oscillatory behavior. To the right of R_{DM}, $F(r)$ exhibits exponentially decaying behavior. Note also that almost all the dark matter is contained in the region $r \leqslant R_{\mathrm{DM}}$, or in other words, $M(R_{\mathrm{DM}}) \approx M_\infty$.

Definition 2. Given a static state $(\omega; M, V, F)$, we define R_{DM} to be the radius at which the function F switches from oscillatory to exponential behavior. We regard $r = R_{\mathrm{DM}}$ as the edge of the dark matter halo because almost all the dark matter is contained in the region $r \leqslant R_{\mathrm{DM}}$. See figure 2.

From equation (10c), we see that R_{DM} satisfies $\Upsilon^2 - \omega^2 e^{-2V(R_{\mathrm{DM}})} = 0$, which implies

$$\omega e^{-V(R_{\mathrm{DM}})} = \Upsilon. \tag{25}$$

This has a very natural physical interpretation—the frequency measured for the dark matter at $r = R_{\mathrm{DM}}$ is always Υ. See equation (28).

How do we manage to avoid the exponential growth term in the first solution in equation (24)? A generic solution should include both terms, and indeed this is the case. However for special initial conditions, only the exponential decay term appears. This is why there are only countably many solutions for any fixed Υ and ω. In fact our actual method of solving on the computer is as follows: fix a value for $V(0)$ consistent with $k(0) < 0$ and then begin varying $F(0)$. Increasing $F(0)$ means that we get more oscillations before reaching R_{DM} and decreasing $F(0)$ means fewer oscillations. Thus to get a ground state or a particular excited state we can only consider values for $F(0)$ in a particular range. In that range, there is only one value of $F(0)$ such that $F(r)$ exponentially decays for all $r > R_{\mathrm{DM}}$. For all other values of $F(0)$, the solution includes an exponential growth term which dominates as $r \to \infty$, and we cannot consider such a solution because of the finite mass requirement. Once we have found (to within the



Figure 3: Solving for the ground state with $\Upsilon = 100$ and $\omega = 99, 95, 90, 85$. As ω decreases we leave the low-field, nonrelativistic limit. The more solid graphs are the solutions obtained using the exact system (10), and the fainter graphs are the solutions obtained using the low-field, nonrelativistic limit system (22).

desired accuracy) the correct value of $F(0)$, we then consider the fact that we probably do not have $V_\infty = 0$. We then vary $V(0)$ and begin again. By varying $V(0)$ in an outer loop and $F(0)$ in an inner loop, we can find a solution $(\omega; M, V, F)$ satisfying all our requirements.

Next we consider the effect of changing ω. Recall that Υ is to be regarded as a fundamental constant of nature. On the other hand, ω is a parameter we can vary. Once we have chosen ω, there is then a unique ground state, first excited state, second excited state, etc. We find experimentally using the exact system (10) that for values of ω close to Υ we are in the low-field, nonrelativistic limit, but as ω decreases, the mass of the state increases, R_{DM} decreases, and we leave the low-field, nonrelativistic limit. This is illustrated in figure 3 for the ground state. Thus: *For fixed Υ, there is a one-parameter family of ground states (or first excited states, second excited states, etc.)* We can parametrize these states using the parameter ω, but we can also parametrize them differently, for example, using M_∞ or R_{DM}. In an upcoming paper [7] we will explore other ways to parametrize the states.

One interesting fact about this one-parameter family of states is that the states which fall in the low-field, nonrelativistic limit are all scalings of each other. Suppose $(\omega; M, V, F)$ solves the low-field, nonrelativistic limit system (22), and let $\lambda > 0$ be a scaling factor. We can obtain another solution $(\bar{\omega}; \bar{M}, \bar{V}, \bar{F})$ to equation (22) by performing the following scalings:

$$\bar{r} = \lambda^{-1} r \tag{26a}$$

$$(1 - \bar{\omega}/\Upsilon) = \lambda^2 (1 - \omega/\Upsilon) \tag{26b}$$

$$\bar{M} = \lambda M \tag{26c}$$

$$\bar{V} = \lambda^2 V \tag{26d}$$

$$\bar{F} = \lambda^2 F. \tag{26e}$$

This is easy to see directly from the system (22). Of course λ cannot be too large or too small or we will leave the low-field, nonrelativistic limit. We can think of this state of affairs in the following way: in the low-field, nonrelativistic limit, there is a unique ground state (first excited state, second excited state, etc.) except for a scaling factor. Imposing one more condition will "fix a scaling" and give us a unique sequence of static states corresponding to $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.

5 A Tully-Fisher-Like Relation

With this background we can describe the main result of this paper, which is that fixing the oscillation frequency of wave dark matter near the edge of dark galactic halos implies a Tully-Fisher-like relation for those halos. We will show this for the static states described above.

Given a finite mass static state $(\omega; M, V, F)$, we define

Definition 3

$$\omega_{\text{true}}(r) = \omega e^{-V(r)}. \tag{27}$$

This is a physical quantity—the true frequency of the dark matter that would be measured at a particular value of r. The factor $e^{-V(r)}$ comes from the metric (8). Using the previous definition and equation (25), we see that R_{DM} satisfies, and in fact is characterized by,

$$\omega_{\text{true}}(R_{\text{DM}}) = \Upsilon. \tag{28}$$

Since $V(r)$ increases with r, $\omega_{\text{true}}(r)$ decreases with r.

We now impose the condition

$$\omega_{\text{true}}(R_{\text{DM}} + r_0) = \omega_0 \tag{29}$$

for some fixed constants r_0 and ω_0, where $r_0 \ll R_{\text{DM}}$ and $\omega_0 < \Upsilon$. It turns out that this is roughly equivalent to requiring the half-length of the exponential tail of each static state to be the same. This will be explored in detail in an upcoming paper [7]. Per our discussion in the previous section, this condition fixes a scaling of the static states. We wish to demonstrate that the sequence of static states ($n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$) obeys a Tully-Fisher-like relation.

Let $(\omega; M, V, F)$ be one of these static states. For $r \geqslant R_{\text{DM}}$, $M(r) \approx M_\infty$ and thus from equation (22b) we get $V(r) \approx -M_\infty/r$ for $r \geqslant R_{\text{DM}}$. Then from equation (27) we have

$$\log \omega_{\text{true}}(r) = \log \omega - V(r) \approx \log \omega + M_\infty/r \tag{30}$$

for $r \geqslant R_{\text{DM}}$ so that, using equations (28) to (30),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log \Upsilon - \log \omega_0}{r_0} &= \frac{\log \omega_{\text{true}}(R_{\text{DM}}) - \log \omega_{\text{true}}(R_{\text{DM}} + r_0)}{r_0} \\ &\approx \frac{\frac{M_\infty}{R_{\text{DM}}} - \frac{M_\infty}{R_{\text{DM}}+r_0}}{r_0} \\ &= \frac{M_\infty}{R_{\text{DM}}(R_{\text{DM}} + r_0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Let v_{outer} be the circular velocity of matter at R_{DM}. From Newtonian mechanics,

$$v_{\text{outer}}^2 = \text{acceleration} \cdot R_{\text{DM}} = \frac{M(R_{\text{DM}})}{R_{\text{DM}}^2} R_{\text{DM}} \approx \frac{M_\infty}{R_{\text{DM}}} \tag{32}$$

Substituting $R_{\text{DM}} \approx M_\infty / v_{\text{outer}}^2$ into equation (31), we obtain

$$\frac{\log \Upsilon - \log \omega_0}{r_0} \approx \frac{M_\infty}{\frac{M_\infty}{v_{\text{outer}}^2}\left(\frac{M_\infty}{v_{\text{outer}}^2} + r_0\right)} = \frac{v_{\text{outer}}^4}{M_\infty + r_0 v_{\text{outer}}^2}. \tag{33}$$

This approximation holds for each static state $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. The expression on the left side is a constant. Looking at the right side, we see v_{outer}^4 in the numerator and

M_∞ in the denominator; thus, anticipating our final result below, we call the constant on the left side $\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}^{-1}$. Thus

$$\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}^{-1} = \frac{\log \Upsilon - \log \omega_0}{r_0} \approx \frac{v_{\mathrm{outer}}^4}{M_\infty + r_0 v_{\mathrm{outer}}^2}. \tag{34}$$

Rearranging, we have

$$M_\infty \approx \tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}} v_{\mathrm{outer}}^4 - r_0 v_{\mathrm{outer}}^2. \tag{35}$$

To write this in a more palatable form, we introduce the constant

$$v_{\mathrm{asy}}^2 = \frac{r_0}{\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}}. \tag{36}$$

We can then write

$$M_\infty \approx \tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}} (v_{\mathrm{outer}}^4 - v_{\mathrm{asy}}^2 v_{\mathrm{outer}}^2). \tag{37}$$

Taking logarithms, we obtain

$$\log M_\infty \approx \log \tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}} + 4 \log v_{\mathrm{outer}} + \log(1 - (v_{\mathrm{asy}}/v_{\mathrm{outer}})^2). \tag{38}$$

This is our result. For $v_{\mathrm{outer}} \gg v_{\mathrm{asy}}$, we have

$$\log M_\infty \approx \log \tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}} + 4 \log v_{\mathrm{outer}}, \tag{39}$$

i.e.

$$\frac{M_\infty}{v_{\mathrm{outer}}^4} \approx \tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}. \tag{40}$$

This is a Tully-Fisher-like relation. The log-log plot of M_∞ versus v_{outer} is a line with slope 4. As v_{outer} approaches v_{asy} from above, the log-log plot exhibits a vertical asymptote at the velocity v_{asy}. See figure 4. It is interesting to note that the empirical baryonic Tully-Fisher relation also might exhibit this asymptote-like behavior—see, for example, Figure 1 of [12]. On the other hand, other boundary conditions similar to equation (29) do not give this vertical asymptote, as discussed in an upcoming paper [7].

In figure 4 we show two log-log plots modeled after Figure 1 of [12] which show that the static states do indeed follow this Tully-Fisher-like relation. These static states were obtained by solving the exact system of ODEs (10). To make these plots we needed to choose values for $\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}$ and v_{asy}. For our purposes in this paper the specific values of these constants do not matter very much as we are only demonstrating the existence of a Tully-Fisher-like relation for wave dark matter and not yet trying to fit it to data. We chose $\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}} = k_{\mathrm{TF}}$ where k_{TF} is given by equation (1) and $v_{\mathrm{asy}} = 5\,\mathrm{km/s}$. Using these values of v_{asy} and $\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}$, we used equations (34) and (36) to solve for r_0 and ω_0 and then had a computer generate the static states. We comment that the total mass M_∞ is an increasing function of n.

The question of what $\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}$ should be is an interesting one. The baryonic Tully-Fisher relation (1) is a relationship between total *baryonic* matter M_b and circular velocity V,



Figure 4: A Tully-Fisher-like relation for static states obtained from solving the Einstein-Klein-Gordon equations (4) using the system of ODEs (10). These plots for $\Upsilon = 100$ (left) and $\Upsilon = 100\,000$ (right) show selected static states between $n = 0$ and $n = 500$ on the solid curve given by equation (38). The ground state appears on the bottom left of each plot and the masses of the static states increase with n.

where each galaxy's V is obtained from a rotation curve which presumably does not extend all the way out to the edge of the dark matter halo. On the other hand, the Tully-Fisher-like relation which we have found for spherically symmetric static states is a relationship between the total *dark* matter M_∞ and the circular velocity v_{outer} at R_{DM}. To connect these, we need to relate M_b to M_∞ and V to v_{outer}. A reasonable guess is that they should be roughly proportional: $M_\infty \approx CM_b$ where $C > 1$, since the quantity of dark matter dominates regular matter, and $v_{\text{outer}} \approx cV$, where $0 < c < 1$. In this case $\tilde{k}_{\text{TF}}$ would be related to k_{TF} by

$$\tilde{k}_{\text{TF}} = \frac{M_\infty}{v_{\text{outer}}^4} \approx \frac{CM_b}{(cV)^4} = \frac{C}{c^4} k_{\text{TF}}. \tag{41}$$

Hence, to the extent that $\log(C)$ and $\log(c)$ are roughly constant across galaxies, then the baryonic Tully-Fisher relation is roughly equivalent to our Tully-Fisher-like relation for wave dark matter, as can be seen using equation (39).

6 Discussion, Conjectures, and Testable Predictions

One of the most important open questions in astrophysics concerns the nature of dark matter. In this section, we describe a testable prediction of the wave dark matter

model (also known as scalar field dark matter (SFDM), boson star dark matter, and Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) dark matter). Assuming a new idea called "dark matter saturation" described below and made precise in Physics Conjecture 1, given the distribution of the baryonic matter in a galaxy, we should be able to compute the distribution of the wave dark matter and hence the total mass distribution, as long as everything is approximately static and spherically symmetric. With the total mass distribution in hand it will be possible to compare to observations—for example, to compute rotation curves. These predictions will be possible once specific stability questions, described below, are answered.

If we assume that dark matter in many galaxies is approximately static and spherically symmetric, then it makes sense to look for static, spherically symmetric solutions to wave dark matter. Referring back to the scaling equations (26), we see that there is a two-parameter family of static spherically symmetric solutions. These two parameters are (n, λ), where $n \geqslant 0$ is an integer referring to the excited state and λ is the scaling factor. Recall that $n = 0$ refers to the ground state, and that more generally n is the number of zeros of $F(r)$ from equation (9).

Now suppose that we solve for wave dark matter solutions in the presence of regular matter (which, for our purposes here, we will also assume is spherically symmetric and static). While the regular matter, through gravity, will change each wave dark matter solution, we still expect to find a two parameter (n, λ) family of solutions.

One great benefit of our discussion so far is that it removes one of the parameters, namely the continuous parameter λ. In this paper, we showed that the boundary condition

$$\omega_{\text{true}}(R_{\text{DM}} + r_0) = \omega_0, \tag{42}$$

for some r_0 and ω_0, is roughly what is needed to recover a Tully-Fisher-like relation. The boundary condition in equation (42) is roughly equivalent to fixing the half-length of the exponentially decaying tail of the wave dark matter solution. In an upcoming paper [7], equation (42) is generalized to a class of "Tully-Fisher boundary conditions" which, generally speaking, fix some property of the wave dark matter near or at the edge of the halo. All Tully-Fisher boundary conditions are roughly equivalent and give a Tully-Fisher-like relation. To be clear, we have not explained why a Tully-Fisher boundary condition should be expected from the theory, just that something close to it seems necessary to be compatible with the observations which make up the baryonic Tully-Fisher relation. In any case, assuming this boundary condition effectively determines λ, leaving only one parameter free, namely n.

What should the value of n be? Given a regular matter distribution, for each n we get a precise wave dark matter distribution which satisfies the above boundary condition. Some of these wave dark matter solutions will be stable and some will be unstable. Numerical results show that ground states of wave dark matter are stable while excited states, without any other matter around, are unstable [9]. On the other hand, [9] also shows that excited states may be stabilized by the presence of another matter field. Our conjecture is that the regular, visible, baryonic matter stabilizes wave

dark matter in galaxies. In fact, given a regular matter distribution, we conjecture that there exists a largest value of n, call it N, for which the corresponding wave dark matter solution is stable. We conjecture that galaxies are described best by choosing $n = N$.

The total mass of the spherically symmetric static states described in this paper increases with n and we expect the same to be true for the distributions of dark matter we are describing now. Thus, setting $n = N$ is consistent with the idea that galaxies are "dark matter saturated", meaning that they are holding as much dark matter as possible, subject to the boundary condition above. Since galaxies typically exist in clusters which are mostly made of dark matter, it seems likely that they are regularly bombarded by dark matter, so that it would be natural for them to reach this state of saturation $n = N$.

To make this discussion precise, we need a model for the regular matter. In order to study stability questions, we need to know how the regular matter distribution changes as the wave dark matter distribution changes, and vice versa.

For example, a relatively simple way to model regular matter is with another scalar field. There are others ways to model regular matter which we do not discuss here. We caution the reader that this second scalar field is only a practical device for approximately modeling the regular baryonic matter—namely the gas, dust, and stars in a galaxy. In no way are we suggesting a second scalar field should exist physically. Furthermore, the parameters of this second scalar field are chosen simply to fit the regular matter distribution of a galaxy as well as possible.

Let f_1 exactly model wave dark matter with its fundamental constant of nature Υ_1. Let f_2 be a convenient device for approximately modeling the regular baryonic matter consisting of the gas, dust, and stars of a galaxy, where Υ_2, which is not a fundamental constant of nature, is chosen as desired to best fit the regular matter. The action is then

$$\mathcal{F}(g, f_1, f_2) = \int \left[R_g - 2\Lambda - 16\pi \left(|f_1|^2 + \frac{|df_1|^2}{\Upsilon_1^2} + |f_2|^2 + \frac{|df_2|^2}{\Upsilon_2^2} \right) \right] dV_g, \tag{43}$$

where Λ is the cosmological constant and may as well be assumed to be zero for our discussion on the scale of galaxies. The above action results in the following Euler-Lagrange equations:

$$\begin{aligned} G + \Lambda g = 8\pi \Bigg[& \frac{df_1 \otimes d\bar{f}_1 + d\bar{f}_1 \otimes df_1}{\Upsilon_1^2} - \left(|f_1|^2 + \frac{|df_1|^2}{\Upsilon_1^2} \right) g \\ & \frac{df_2 \otimes d\bar{f}_2 + d\bar{f}_2 \otimes df_2}{\Upsilon_2^2} - \left(|f_2|^2 + \frac{|df_2|^2}{\Upsilon_2^2} \right) g \Bigg] \end{aligned} \tag{44a}$$

$$\Box_g f_1 = \Upsilon_1^2 f_1 \tag{44b}$$

$$\Box_g f_2 = \Upsilon_2^2 f_2 \tag{44c}$$

We approximate the regular matter distribution with a ground state solution for f_2. We have two free parameters with which to approximate the given regular matter distribution, namely Υ_2 and the "scaling parameter" for the ground state solution, which we could call λ_2. This should allow us to choose two physical characteristics of the regular matter. We choose to specify the total mass M_b and the radius R_b of the regular matter, perhaps defined as that radius within which some fixed percentage of the regular matter is contained.

As described already, we impose the boundary condition in equation (42) for f_1. Then for each choice of $n \geqslant 0$, we get a solution to the system of equations (44) which reduces to a system of ODEs in a manner very similar as before. Some solutions will be stable and some will be unstable. Since we now have the dynamical equations (44), these stability questions are now fairly well defined.

Hence, for each M_b, R_b, and n, we get a static, spherically symmetric solution to equation (44) satisfying the boundary condition in equation (42).

Math Conjecture 1. In the low-field, nonrelativistic limit, for each choice of total regular mass M_b and regular matter diameter R_b, there exists an integer $N \geqslant 0$ such that static, spherically symmetric solutions to equation (44) satisfying the boundary condition in equation (42) with $n \leqslant N$ are stable and those with $n > N$ are unstable.

If this math conjecture is true, or even if there is just a largest or most massive stable n, then there is a natural physics conjecture to make as well.

Physics Conjecture 1 ("Dark Matter Saturation")**.** The dark matter and total matter distributions of most galaxies which are approximately static and spherically symmetric are approximately described by static, spherically symmetric solutions to equation (44) satisfying the boundary condition in equation (42) with $n = N$.

This last conjecture only leaves three parameters open, namely Υ, the fundamental constant of nature in the wave dark matter theory, and r_0 and ω_0 from the boundary condition in equation (42). These last two parameters are equivalent to choosing values for $\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}$ and v_{asy}, the last of which is not relevant for most galaxies. Hence, there are effectively only two parameters, namely Υ and $\tilde{k}_{\mathrm{TF}}$, left open, with which to fit the dark matter and total matter distributions of most of the galaxies in the universe. Hence, the physics conjecture stated above should be a good test of the wave dark matter theory.

References

[1] W. J. G. de Blok et al. "High-Resolution Rotation Curves and Galaxy Mass Models from THINGS". In: *Astron. J.* 136.6 (Nov. 2008), pp. 2648–2719. DOI: 10.1088/0004-6256/136/6/2648.

[2] Hubert L. Bray. "On Dark Matter, Spiral Galaxies, and the Axioms of General Relativity". In: *Geometric Analysis, Mathematical Relativity, and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. Vol. 599. Contemp. Math. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013, pp. 1–64. DOI: 10.1090/conm/599/11945. arXiv:1004.4016 [physics.gen-ph].

[3] Hubert L. Bray. *On Wave Dark Matter, Shells in Elliptical Galaxies, and the Axioms of General Relativity*. Dec. 2012. arXiv:1212.5745 [physics.gen-ph].

[4] Hubert L. Bray and Alan R. Parry. *Modeling Wave Dark Matter in Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies*. Jan. 2013. arXiv:1301.0255 [astro-ph.GA].

[5] Benoît Famaey and Stacy S. McGaugh. "Modified Newtonian Dynamics (MOND): Observational Phenomenology and Relativistic Extensions". In: *Living Reviews in Relativity* 15.10 (2012). DOI: 10.12942/lrr-2012-10.

[6] D. Gerbal et al. "Analysis of X-ray Galaxy Clusters in the Framework of Modified Newtonian Dynamics". In: *Astron. & Astrophys.* 262 (Sept. 1992), pp. 395–400.

[7] Andrew S. Goetz. "Tully-Fisher Scalings and Boundary Conditions for Wave Dark Matter". In preparation.

[8] F Siddhartha Guzmán and Tonatiuh Matos. "Scalar Fields as Dark Matter in Spiral Galaxies". In: *Classical and Quantum Gravity* 17.1 (2000), p. L9. DOI: 10.1088/0264-9381/17/1/102.

[9] Chi Wai Lai and Matthew W. Choptuik. "Final Fate of Subcritical Evolutions of Boson Stars". In: (Sept. 2007). arXiv:0709.0324 [gr-qc].

[10] Juan Magaña and Tonatiuh Matos. "A Brief Review of the Scalar Field Dark Matter Model". In: *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 378.1 (2012). DOI: 10.1088/1742-6596/378/1/012012. arXiv:1201.6107 [astro-ph].

[11] M. Markevitch et al. "Direct Constraints on the Dark Matter Self-Interaction Cross Section from the Merging Galaxy Cluster 1E 065756". In: *Astrophys. J.* 606.2 (May 2004), pp. 819–824. DOI: 10.1086/383178.

[12] Stacy S. McGaugh et al. "The Baryon Content of Cosmic Structures". In: *Astrophys. J. Lett.* 708.1 (Jan. 2010), pp. L14–L17. DOI: 10.1088/2041-8205/708/1/L14. arXiv:0911.2700 [astro-ph.CO].

[13] Mordehai Milgrom. "A Modification of the Newtonian Dynamics as a Possible Alternative to the Hidden Mass Hypothesis". In: *Astrophys. J.* 270 (June 1983), pp. 365–370. DOI: 10.1086/161130.

[14] Alan R. Parry. "A Survey of Spherically Symmetric Spacetimes". In: *Analysis and Mathematical Physics* (July 2014). DOI: 10.1007/s13324-014-0085-x. arXiv:1210.5269 [gr-qc].

[15] Alan R. Parry. *Spherically Symmetric Static States of Wave Dark Matter*. Dec. 2012. arXiv:1212.6426 [gr-qc].

[16] Alan R. Parry. "Wave Dark Matter and Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies". Ph.D. Duke University, 2012. arXiv:1311.6087 [gr-gc].

[17] Vera C. Rubin, W. Kent Ford, and Norbert Thonnard. "Rotational Properties of 21 Sc Galaxies with a large range of luminosities and radii, from NGC 4605 (R = 4kpc) to UGC 2885 (R = 122 kpc)". In: *Astrophys. J.* 238 (June 1980), pp. 471–487. DOI: 10.1086/158003.

[18] R. H. Sanders. "The Virial Discrepancy in Clusters of Galaxies in the Context of Modified Newtonian Dynamics". In: *Astrophys. J. Lett.* 512 (Feb. 1999), pp. L23–L26. DOI: 10.1086/311865. arXiv:astro-ph/9807023.

[19] R. Sharma, S. Karmakar, and S. Mukherjee. "Boson star and dark matter". In: (Dec. 2008). arXiv:0812.3470 [gr-qc].

[20] Sang-Jin Sin. "Late-time Phase Transition and the Galactic Halo as a Bose Liquid". In: *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (6 Sept. 1994), pp. 3650–3654. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.50.3650. arXiv:hep-ph/9205208.

[21] Abril Surez, Victor H. Robles, and Tonatiuh Matos. "A Review on the Scalar Field/Bose-Einstein Condensate Dark Matter Model". English. In: *Accelerated Cosmic Expansion*. Ed. by Claudia Moreno Gonzlez, Jos Edgar Madriz Aguilar, and Luz Marina Reyes Barrera. Vol. 38. Astrophysics and Space Science Proceedings. Springer International Publishing, 2014, pp. 107–142. ISBN: 978-3-319-02062-4. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-02063-1_9.

[22] R. Brent Tully and James Richard Fisher. "A New Method of Determining Distances to Galaxies". In: *Astron. & Astrophys.* 54 (Feb. 1977), pp. 661–673.

Unit	**Seconds**	**Years**	**Meters**	**AUs**
kilogram	2.48×10^{-36}	7.85×10^{-44}	7.43×10^{-28}	4.96×10^{-39}
Astronomical Body	**Seconds**	**Years**	**Meters**	**AUs**
Sun	4.93×10^{-6}	1.56×10^{-13}	1480	9.87×10^{-9}
Earth	1.48×10^{-11}	4.69×10^{-19}	0.004 43	2.96×10^{-14}
Moon	1.82×10^{-13}	5.77×10^{-21}	5.45×10^{-5}	3.65×10^{-16}
Jupiter	4.70×10^{-9}	1.49×10^{-16}	1.41	9.42×10^{-12}
Cygnus X-1 black hole	7.4×10^{-5}	2.3×10^{-12}	22 000	1.5×10^{-7}
Sag A* black hole	20	6×10^{-7}	6×10^{9}	0.04
Milky Way	10^{7}	10^{-1}	10^{15}	10^{4}

Table 1: Common masses in geometrical units of time or distance.

Unit	**Meters**	**AUs**	**Kilograms**	**Solar Masses**
second	3.00×10^{8}	0.002 00	4.04×10^{35}	203 000
day	2.59×10^{13}	173	3.49×10^{40}	1.75×10^{10}
year	9.46×10^{15}	63 200	1.27×10^{43}	6.41×10^{12}
Astronomical Time	**Meters**	**AUs**	**Kilograms**	**Solar Masses**
age of universe	1.31×10^{26}	8.73×10^{14}	1.76×10^{53}	8.84×10^{22}
age of solar system	4.3×10^{25}	2.9×10^{14}	5.8×10^{52}	2.9×10^{22}

Table 2: Common times in geometrical units of distance or mass.

Unit	**Kilograms**	**Solar Masses**	**Seconds**	**Years**
meter	1.35×10^{27}	0.000 677	3.34×10^{-9}	1.06×10^{-16}
AU	2.01×10^{38}	1.01×10^{8}	499	1.58×10^{-5}
light-year	1.27×10^{43}	6.41×10^{12}	3.16×10^{7}	1
parsec	4.16×10^{43}	2.09×10^{13}	1.03×10^{8}	3.26
Astronomical Body	**Kilograms**	**Solar Masses**	**Seconds**	**Years**
Sun (mean radius)	9.37×10^{35}	471 000	2.32	7.36×10^{-8}
Earth (mean radius)	8.58×10^{33}	4310	0.0213	6.73×10^{-10}
Moon (mean radius)	2.34×10^{33}	1180	0.005 79	1.84×10^{-10}
Jupiter (mean radius)	9.41×10^{34}	47 300	0.233	7.39×10^{-9}

Table 3: Common distances in geometrical units of mass or time.